

REMARKS

1. Status of the Claims

Claims 1 – 8, 10 – 22, and 24 – 28 are pending in the present application. Claims 9 and 23 were canceled in an amendment filed on November 2, 2004. Claims 1, 14, 15 and 28 have been amended in response to the claim objections found at pages 3 – 4 of the Office Action. Additional amendments have been made to the independent and dependent claims to improve clarity. No new matter has been entered.

At the outset, Applicants believe the amendments to the claims overcome the rejection under 37 CFR 1.75 and should be entered and made of record.

II. Claim objections

Starting at the bottom of page 2 until the top of page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner suggested amendments to claims 1, 14, 15 and 28 with respect to the terms “wavelet data stream” and “wavelet data format stream”. such that “wavelet data stream” is now used exclusively.

The Examiner’s objection to the claims under 37 CFR 1.75(a) as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter to which the Applicants regards as their invention is respectfully traversed.

According to the Examiner, the metes and bounds of the phrase starting with "retrieving information from said spatial database using metadata and geocode..." is unclear. Applicants have amended the claims to rectify the Examiner's confusion.

In response to the Examiner's comment at page 3, paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the phrase "on the vector data; data," has been canceled. The Examiner was confused as to the phrase "geographical information" as found in part (l) of claim 1. Applicants point out that the expression "geographical information" is recited in the preamble of the claim and is generic to all "geographical information" in the body of the claim.

The Examiner found the metes and bounds of the term "spatial information" unclear. The claims have been amended to remove all of the terms objected to by the Examiner. However, both "the spatial information and map viewer" and "the spatial information and map editor" are defined devices clearly seen in Figure 1 at reference numerals 6 and 7, respectively.

The Examiner found the term "information" to be unclear as recited in parts (i), (j) and (k) of the independent claims. Applicants have amended the claims to unify the use of the term "information" by canceling "retrieving information from said spatial database" and merging part (j) into part (i) of claim 1 and bridging the

two parts. Moreover, the term "information" has been canceled in part (k). The other independent claims have been amended in a similar fashion.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objections to the claims under 37 CFR 1.75(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn. Independent of the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103, the claims should be entered since they are now clear and concise for purpose of appeal.

III. Claim rejections under 35 USC 103

The Examiner has rejected the claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over USP 6,430,498 B1 in view of USP Publication 2002/0080408 A1, USP 5,864,632, USP 6,278,432 B1, USP 6,542,191 B1 and USP 6,307,573. The Examiner found USP 6,430,498 B1 to show a spatial information database, but conceded that the reference does not show two separate databases. The Examiner alleges that it would be obvious from USP 6,307,573 to show that it would have been obvious to "section off the Maruyama's [USP 6,430,498 B1] single database into two separate databases as taught by Barros [USP 6,307,573]." Unfortunately, the Examiner is apparently confused by the subject invention and the significance of the two separate databases in the subject invention.

In this regard, Applicants submit that a person skilled in the art would not have been led to the present invention, because there is no suggestion or motivation from the combination of references to employ a geographical map image

storage database for storing image raster data and a separate spatial database for vector data much less how to integrate them. Moreover, it makes no sense to separate the single database of USP 6,430,498 B1 into two databases as alleged by the Examiner.

Although USP 6,307,573 does show both a topical database and base map database, these are not relevant to the two databases in the subject claims. Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to USP 6,307,573 at column 10, lines 23-25, where it states:

“[s]elect mapping elements commonly known as Base elements will be stored in the Base memory module and the Topical elements in the Topical memory module.”

Clearly, the topical elements and base elements are intended to be segregated but not as two separate databases for independently storing raster image data and vector data. In the subject invention, there are two kinds of databases which are separate and distinct from one another. The two databases defined in the specification and claims include:

1. Spatial database
2. Geographical map image database.

The spatial database is used for storing vector data only, for example, river or street coordinates can be provided as a series of x, y pairs.

The geographical map image database is used for storing image data which might be taken from satellite. Applicants call this image a raster map that would be formed using a wavelet algorithm. The format for this raster map may be stored in TIFF format.

Spatial information corresponding to, for example, a road or river, is converted into coordinate data in a series of x, y pairs for storage in the spatial database separate from the geographical map image database and may be displayed on top of the displayed map image data. Raster map images or satellite images are taken by satellite and are stored, e.g., in TIFF format in the geographical map image database.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

It is respectfully noted that if the Examiner maintains this rejection, Applicant also intends to submit a certified English-translation of the priority document, Thailand Patent Application No. 055604, filed on February 4, 2000 to antedate USP 6,430,498 B1.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as defined in claims 1-8, 10-22 and 24-28 is in full compliance with all the statutory requirements of Title 35 USC, and, therefore, it is earnestly requested that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn and that the pending claims be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted
Attorney for Applicant,

Dated: May 1, 2006

By: 

Eugene Lieberstein
Registration No. 24,645

CUSTOMER NO. 01109

ANDERSON KILL & OLICK, P.C.
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1182
(212) 278-1000

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this *Amendment After Final Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.116* is being deposited with the United States Postal Service via First Class Mail addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on May 1, 2006.


Audrey de Souza